



**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**  
3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-3010



MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS  
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMMAND,  
CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS AND INTELLIGENCE)  
GENERAL COUNSEL  
INSPECTOR GENERAL  
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION  
DIRECTORS OF DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Single Process Initiative

Secretary Perry's memorandum of December 6, 1995 requested that I promulgate guidance for making block changes to existing contracts to unify the management and manufacturing requirements of those contracts on a facility-wide basis, wherever such changes are technically acceptable to the government. Secretary Perry further directed that the single point of contact for this effort will be the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) assigned to a facility. Accordingly, I am providing the following additional guidance on these issues.

Replacement of multiple government-unique management and manufacturing systems with common, facility-wide systems should, in the long run, reduce the costs to both our contractors and the DoD. Contractors will, however, in most cases incur transition costs that equal or exceed savings in the near term. We expect that cases where this does not hold true are in the minority, mostly dealing with high value, long-term contracts. Accordingly, I direct use of an expedited, streamlined approach to ensure that the contractors' proposals of block changes are technically acceptable and to quickly identify those cases where there may be a significant decrease in the cost of performance of existing contracts.

ACOs are directed to encourage contractors to prepare and submit concept papers (see the attached TAB A) describing practices that will permit uniform, efficient facility-wide management and manufacturing systems and a method for moving to such systems. Contractor recommendations included in the concept paper should be accompanied by a cost-benefit analysis adequate to determine the rough order of magnitude of the costs and benefits to the contractor of the proposed system changes (including any impact on the cost of performance of existing contracts). This cost benefit analysis shall be performed without requesting certified cost or pricing data. The detail included in these concept papers/cost analyses is intended to be just sufficient to allow an informed,

rapid judgement by the ACO on whether proposed changes to management and manufacturing processes can be approved on a no-cost, block change basis, applying guidance in this letter.

Where such a proposal is technically acceptable and there are no significant net savings in the cost of performing existing contracts, the ACO, after appropriate consultation with program managers, shall issue class modifications to those contracts without seeking an equitable adjustment. In those cases where the contractor's proposal will result in significant decreases in the overall net cost of performance of existing contracts, the contractor should be asked to submit a formal proposal for an equitable adjustment (consideration) and to submit separate, detailed cost data in support of the proposed amount. The negotiation of equitable adjustments should not delay the modification of contracts.

Note that the specific shift from MIL-Q-9858A to ISO-9000 does not in itself result in significant contractor savings in most contracts, and hence can be made on an expedited basis.

I also direct that, effective immediately, ACOs have the authority to execute class modifications, subject to receipt of necessary programmatic authorization from affected components.

The Commander, Defense Contract Management Command (DCMC) shall approve all requests for certified cost or pricing data in connection with this initiative unless such data are required by law. He will also be the focal point for implementing these efforts within DoD, and will facilitate the coordination of the change process. Tab A depicts the block change process detailing underlying assumptions, roles, and responsibilities.

The Commander, DCMC should prepare for me and for the Component Acquisition Executives a brief quarterly report that describes the progress achieved in replacing multiple government-unique management and manufacturing requirements in existing contracts with more efficient, common facility-wide practices.

*Paul G. Kaminski*

Paul G. Kaminski

## **BLOCK CHANGE PROCESS**

The block change process depicted here designates DCMC as the lead facilitator to implement plant-wide changes. The process is built on existing structures within the components and OSD and is designed to create a sense of urgency in the approval process for streamlining of specifications, standards or other processes.

## **PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT**

Industry is encouraged to prepare and submit concept papers for streamlining specifications and standards with emphasis on early customer involvement and interface. Once the cost and benefit of the change has been determined through this early involvement, industry shall submit block change proposals. As a minimum, the proposals should detail the proposed processes and associated metrics, rough order of magnitude cost benefit analysis, the consequent changes in government's involvement in the process and required regulatory/contractual changes.

## **APPROVAL**

Following submittal of the proposal, the Contract Administration Office (CAO) shall determine the contractual/regulatory scope of change, confirm the component customer base impacted and, if required, organize a local management council based on the nature of the proposal. The management council should be comprised of senior level representatives from the local CAO, the cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) office, the contractor and subject matter experts representing the key customers within the affected components. Notionally, the key customer base shall be comprised of customers who represent 80% of the total dollar value of affected contracts.

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The role of the management council is to analyze the merits and cost benefits of the change. Empowerment of subject matter experts from the key customer base is critical. To minimize delay, a component team leader should be designated and granted decision authority by the CAE to represent the key customer base. Component team leaders are responsible for achieving consensus with other component team leaders, the key customer PCOs and PMs, the component team members and the CAE. The CAO should be responsible for facilitating and leading the management council. The ACO will have the contractual authority to execute all block changes. The attached diagram shows the decision process along with timelines expected of this streamlined process.

## **INTERNAL GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION PROCESS**

The objective of this process is to resolve disagreements, facilitate consensus, elevate and resolve issues of substantial concern, and reemphasize the overall goal and objective. If there is disagreement between PM or other customers within a component, the issue must be raised to a level within the service as designated by the CAE. If there is disagreement among the components the issue must be raised to a level within the Department as designated by the DAE. Once resolved, the ACO executes the change.




Figure 1